Case	8(11-cv-00536-AG-RNB Document 1/1 F	iled 07/19/13 Page 1 of 5 Page ID #:2800
1		JS-6
2		
3		NOTE CHANGES MADE BY THE COURT
4		,
5		
6		
. 7		
8	UNITED STATES	S DISTRICT COURT
9	CENTRAL DISTR	ICT OF CALIFORNIA
10		
11	R.S., a minor by and through his Guardian Ad Litem STEPHANIE	) Lead Case No.: SACV 11-00536-AG-RNBx
12	SENTELL, and PAMELA AMICI,	) Consolidated Case No.: CV11-06379- ) AG(RNBx)
13	Plaintiffs,	}
14	·	
15	CITY OF LONG BEACH, VICTOR ORTIZ, JEFFREY SHURTLEFF, and DOES 3-10, inclusive,	} <del>)[PROPOSED</del> ] JUDGMENT
16	Defendants.	)
17		_{
18	MARK ZERBY	
19	Plaintiff,	
20	v.	
21	CITY OF LONG BEACH, et al.	
22	Defendants.	
23		_}
24		
25	These consolidated actions came for trial on March 19, 2013, in Courtroom	
26 27	10D of the United States District Court, Central District of California, Southern	
28	Division, Honorable Andrew J. Guilford, presiding. Plaintiffs R.S., a minor by and	
20	through his Guardian ad litem Stephanie Sentell, and Pamela Amici were	
	PROPOSED	JUDGMENT
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		

1	represented by attorney Dale K. Galipo of The Law Offices of Dale K. Galipo, and		
2	Brian E. Claypool of The Claypool Law Firm. Plaintiff Mark Zerby was		
3	represented by Garo Mardirossian and Rowena J. Dizon of Mardirossian &		
4	Associates, Inc., and Thomas E. Beck of The Beck Law Firm. Defendants Victor		
5	Ortiz, Jeffrey Shurtleff, and the City of Long Beach were represented by Monte		
6	Machit of the Long Beach City Attorney's Office and Thomas J. Feeley of the Law		
7	Offices of Thomas J. Feeley.		
8	A jury was regularly empanelled and sworn in. Witnesses were sworn and		
9	testified. After hearing the evidence and arguments of counsel, the jury was duly		
10	instructed by the Court and the case was submitted to the jury. By law, the City of		
11	Long Beach is vicariously liable under Plaintiffs' state law claims. The jury		
12	deliberated and thereafter returned into Court with its verdict as follows.		
13			
14	QUESTION NO. 1		
15	Did any defendant violate decedent's Fourth Amendment rights by using		
16	excessive force?		
17	Officer Shurtleff Yes X No		
18	Officer Ortiz Yes X No		
19			
20	QUESTION NO. 2		
21	Did either Defendant commit a battery against the decedent?		
22	Officer Shurtleff Yes X No		
23	Officer Ortiz Yes X No		
24			
25	\\\\		
26	\\\\		
27	\\\\		
28	\\\\		
	-2 (PROPOSED) HIDGMENT		

(PROPOSED) JUDGMENT

(PROPOSED) JUDGMENT

28

///

1	4. Plaintiffs may also recover costs and attorney's fees pursuant to 42
2	U.S.C. § 1988 and interest on the judgment as the prevailing party on
3	gall claims, attrial
4	
5	IT IS SO ORDERED
6	DATED: JUN 19, 2015
7	Hon Andrew J. Guilford
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

-5 (PROPOSED) JUDGMENT

\*Case 8 11-cv-00536-AG-RNB Document 171 Filed 07/19/13 Page 5 of 5 Page ID #:2804